

Rejections Under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Double Patenting

Claims 18-53 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting as been unpatentable over claims 1-2, 4-24, and 27 of U.S. Patent 5,946,308.

Applicant is filing a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321(b) to overcome this double patenting rejection. The present application and the '308 patent are commonly owned. It is respectfully requested that this double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103


Claim 42, the only claim rejected, has been cancelled. Thus, the §103 rejection has been rendered moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments, and as no remaining claims were rejected on prior art grounds, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,
Dobbins, et al., Applicant



Paul D. Sorkin, Reg. No. 39,039
Therese A. Hendricks, Reg. No. 30,389
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2211
Tel. No. (617) 720-3500
Attorneys of Record

Attorney's Docket No.: C0441/7150
Date: June 20, 2000
x07/26/00